UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/378,218 | 08/19/1999 | JEFFRY JOVAN PHILYAW | PHLY-24.706 | 8858 |

25883 7590 12/22/2004

HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P
P.O. BOX 741715
DALLAS, TX 75374-1715

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| THOMPSON, MARC D | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2144 | |

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/378,218 | PHILYAW ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Marc D. Thompson | 2144 | |

*-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on th cover she t with the correspondenc address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 August 2004* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disp sition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14 and 16-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-7,9-14 and 16-19* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3 and 8* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 January 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

1. The response to the non-final Office action mailed on 3/23/2004, was received 5/23/2004, and has been entered into record.

2. Claims 1-14, and 16-19 remain pending.

### *Priority*

3. This application is a continuation-in-part (CIP) of application number 09/151,530, filed 9/11/1998, now U.S. Patent Number 6,098,106. Presently claimed subject matter directly supported in this patented document is entitled to this effective priority filing date. All new subject matter set forth in the claims (and specification) is not so entitled.

4. The claimed invention set forth in this application (entire combination of independent limitations) will be treated with an effective filing date of 8/19/1999.

### *Drawings*

5. The Examiner contends that the drawings submitted on 1/29/2001 are acceptable for examination proceedings.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR §1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. §103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. §102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

8. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-14, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Portuesi (U.S. Patent Number 5,774,666), hereinafter referred to as Portuesi, in view of Sherman (U.S. Patent Number 5,213,337), hereinafter referred to as Sherman, in view of Hudetz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,978,773), further in view of what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

9. Portuesi disclosed the embedding of URL information in a multimedia presentation, i.e., video with audio. See, inter alia, Column 2, Lines 22-38. The multimedia information was fully capable of being recorded and played back later, e.g., from a computer file, CD, or DVD. See, inter alia, Column 3, Lines 22-29. Further, referenced data was presented during rendering of the digitally stored multimedia information. See Column 2, Lines 39-59. Additional, URL association was enabled to occur specifically with audio information. See Column 3, Lines 30-35, and Column 5, Lines 5-10. The current asserted novelty drawn to a "user perceivable code" was also fully disclosed by Portuesi in Column 6, Lines 12-14; if the displayed hyperlink displays the actual URL address, the code was user perceivable. Thus, Portuesi disclosed the invention substantially as claimed.

10. Portuesi did not disclose two important aspects of the presently claimed and disclosed invention. First, Portuesi did not specifically disclose the use of embedded audio signals which were recognizable to either the rendering machine or a human viewer to effect information retrieval. Second, Portuesi did not specifically disclose effecting information retrieval through the use of a predetermined identification number which corresponded to particular vendor products or services.

In regard to embedded audio signals, Portuesi did expressly disclose the encoding of URL information into the digital multimedia. See, inter alia, Column 9, Lines 5-8, and Figure 5, reference numeral 62. This resulted in a digital video signal (including audio) with embedded URL information, expressly disclosed as capable for digital storage on, inter alia, video disk(s). See, inter alia, Column 9, Lines 3-21. While Portuesi provided a single example for express encoding of the URL information into the multimedia file (Column 9, Lines 8-11), the language used was intentionally open-ended, suggesting other methods of information encoding as potentially used with the concept of invention. This would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to explore related teachings to find suitable means for embedding/encoding URL information into multimedia information.

In regard to information retrieval based on identification numbers which correspond to particular products or services, the natural extension of information relating to product(s) or service(s) being delivered to a requesting or unsolicited consumer in parallel with video and/or audio advertisements would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention. This would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to explore product information retrieval techniques for this purpose; the linking of timely, relevant information corresponding to specific products or services during advertisements would have been recognized as desirable by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

11. In the related art of television (video) and radio (audio) and the encoded use of audio controlling signals, Sherman disclosed the embedding of "substantially indiscernible" audio touch tones which effect functionality of a reception device and the use of these embedded tone(s) on recorded media. See, inter alia, Column 2, Lines 28-47, and Column 3, Lines 14-17.

The audio enabled value embedding as disclosed by Sherman provided yet another type of information encoding for use in the Portuesi system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use encoding/embedding as described by Sherman in the encoding/embedding system described by Portuesi in order to encode strings of values in an audio/video presentation corresponding to URL network address(es) to correlate information with the currently rendered video/audio presentation. Since the audio tones were "substantially indiscernible", it is clear that the tones were "perceivable", and "user perceivable" as claimed.

12. In the related art of database information look-up, Hudetz disclosed the correlation of identification numbers with particular products and vendor information/offers concerning these product(s) using a network of remote database(s). See, inter alia, Column 3, Lines 17-24. It is also noted that Hudetz specifically disclosed two important details: (1) the encoded identification number(s) were in "human and/or machine readable form" (Column 3, Lines 27-28), and (2) an identification number was input which resulted in retrieval of an actual or logical network address (routing information, as claimed) through use of a [usually, remotely] located database for number to address look-up (Column 3, Lines 25-37). In regard to the latter, in light of these cited portions of the Hudetz teachings, the provision for UPC barcode operation for input of identification number(s) did not preclude the use of other types of input device(s), methods, human or machine actuated input, or specific type(s) of alphanumeric string(s) which resulted in arbitrary identification number(s) to physical or logical network address mapping. See Column 3, Lines 25-37. That is, the use of UPC numeric codes scanned by a peripheral reading

device was only one way to achieve the invention as described; a numerical value corresponding to the designated information for database lookup was the crux of the invention as disclosed.

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Portuesi and Sherman providing embedded information within multimedia presentations with the numerical to network address correlation provided by Hudetz, for example, in order to minimize the amount of information added to any given stored or compiled multimedia presentation. Bandwidth conservation and digital storage space was widely recognized as an inherent concern in the computer arts, and minimizing the amount of encoded information in a given multimedia presentation would have been readily evident. The provision for a short string, (e.g., eight or ten numbers) which effects the same information transfer functionality as a much longer URL or product identification designation and network address would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. See, inter alia, Hudetz, Column 3, Lines 1-13, and Column 11, Lines 21-27.

14. In short, Portuesi disclosed a digital multimedia transmission incorporating codes used to effect information retrieval over a network at a user location, Sherman provided a method for audio signal embedding also effecting information transfer on a network, and Hudetz used centralized location of URL information for current, proper information delivery. The combination of these teachings, and any/all modification of the Portuesi base system with the remaining teachings would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention since all the teachings reside in the same art of network information transfer, and each

modular, functional concept elaborated on similar concept(s) provided in the other references. The resulting system would have simply been a straight forward extension of these teachings.

15. This combination of teachings expressly disclosed each and every limitation of the claimed invention as set forth:

(claim 1, 6, 11, 12, 13, 16)

1. *Recorded [digital] information on [digital media]*, was taught, inter alia, by Portuesi in Column 3, Lines 23-26, and was taught by Sherman in Column 3, Lines 14-16. Further, the media which storage takes place on was completely arbitrary and a wide variety of digital storage mediums would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

2. *Embedding a unique user perceivable code in digital video information*, was taught, inter alia, by the combination of teachings found in Portuesi, Column 6, Lines 33-46, and Sherman, Column 3, Lines 7-36. Also see, Portuesi, Column 6, Lines 12-14, for an express teaching of a user perceivable code; if the hyperlink specified the actual URL, clearly this is user perceivable.

3. *Unique user perceivable code is output during normal playback of the [video]*, was taught, inter alia, by Portuesi in Column 5, Lines 64-66, and Sherman, Column 3, Lines 14-17.

4. *Unique user perceivable code [mapping to] vendor routing information defining the route over the network from a user location to a vendor location*, was taught, inter alia, by the combination of teachings provided by Portuesi by related URL inclusion, and Hudetz,

Column 3, Lines 15-37. It is clear Hudetz expressly disclosed the user centralized storage of routing information to effect information retrieval.

5. *Operating the disk [by rendering in information thereon] (reading the data and outputting the data on a display)*, was taught, inter alia, by Portuesi in Column 3, Lines 22-29, and Sherman, Column 3, Lines 14-17.

6. *Extracting the unique user perceivable code during output at the user location*, was taught, inter alia, by Portuesi in Column 5, Lines 64-66, and Sherman, Column 3, Lines 14-17.

7. *Transmitting the unique user perceivable code to an intermediate location on the network*, was taught, inter alia, by Hudetz in Column 3, Lines 15-24.

8. *Returning routing information to the user location used to access information from a vendor*, was taught, inter alia, by Hudetz in Figure 5.

(claim 2, 7, 17, 18, 19)

9. *Accessing a database of vendor routing information, database [correlating] the unique user perceivable code to routing information for a vendor*, was taught, inter alia, by Hudetz in Figure 4.

10. *[Using the unique user perceivable code for] interconnecting the user [computer] with vendor information*, was taught, inter alia, by Hudetz in Figure 5.

(claim 4, 9)

11. *Routing information is a URL, Routing information is a URL*, was taught, inter alia, by Hudetz in Column 3, Lines 25-37.

(claim 5, 10)

12. *Unique perceivable code is an audible tone*, was taught, inter alia, by Sherman in Column 3, Lines 7-36

(claim 14)

13. *Playback is integrated with the user computer*, was taught, inter alia, by Portuesi in Column 2, Lines 50-52.

16. Since all the claimed limitations set forth in claims 1-2, 4-7, and 9-19, were expressly disclosed by the combination of teachings provided by Portuesi, Sherman, and Hudetz, claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-14, and 16-19, are rejected.

17. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-14, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Solvason (U.S. Patent Number 6,003,073), hereinafter referred to as Solvason, in view of Hudetz (U.S. Patent Number 5978,773), hereinafter referred to as Hudetz. Further in view of what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

18. Applicant admits in the response, Paper #24, received on 12/31/2003, at Page 10, Line 22 through Page 11, Line 4, that the teachings of Solvason disclosed "embedding audio signals that are perceivable and which are utilized to effect a connection with a remote location, but the codes are not transmitted to an intermediate location". Thus, Solvason disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, but failed to expressly disclose centralized storage and remote lookup of information relating to audio embedded codes.

19. Solvason specifically recited "...control information...may be used by any member of the listening or viewing public having access to a personal computer equipped with means to

retrieve and use the control information..." and "...communication between the user installation and the 'Internet' or similar types of computer networks..." See, inter alia, Column 2, Lines 33-39, and Column 9, Line 60 through Column 10, Line 4. However, Solvason remained silent to specifics as to how these networks were specifically utilized to effect information retrieval, motivating an ordinary artisan to explore the Internet arts for similar teachings to enable the use of the Internet for information exchange.

20. In these arts, Hudetz disclosed the correlation of identification numbers with particular products and vendor information/offers concerning these product(s) using a network of remote database(s). See, inter alia, Column 3, Lines 17-24. It is also noted that Hudetz specifically disclosed two important details: (1) the encoded identification number(s) were in "human and/or machine readable form" (Column 3, Lines 27-28), and (2) an identification number was input which resulted in retrieval of an actual or logical network address (routing information, as claimed) through use of a [usually, remotely] located database for number to address look-up (Column 3, Lines 25-37). In regard to the latter, in light of these cited portions of the Hudetz teachings, the provision for UPC barcode operation for input of identification number(s) did not preclude the use of other types of input device(s), methods, human or machine actuated input, or specific type(s) of alphanumeric string(s) which resulted in arbitrary identification number(s) to physical or logical network address mapping. See Column 3, Lines 25-37. That is, the use of UPC numeric codes scanned by a peripheral reading device was only one way to achieve the invention as described; a numerical value corresponding to the designated information for database lookup was the crux of the invention as disclosed.

21. These teachings paralleled the teachings of Solvason such that the modification of the information retrieval system set forth by Solvason with the centralized database of Hudetz would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention in order to provide current information retrieval, for example, in the event of network information address change. See, inter alia, Hudetz, Column 3, Lines 1-13.

22. Thus, is it unclear of any difference between the combination of these two well known functional system types in light of the claimed invention.

23. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-14, and 16-19 are rejected.

***Allowable subject matter***

24. Claims 3 and 8 are once again objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

25. The arguments presented by Applicant in the response, received on 8/23/2004, are not considered persuasive. Applicant argues URL information was not disclosed in the prior art as being "embedded within the audio/video bandwidth of the playback system". See, inter alia, Response, received 8/2/3/2004, Page 9. Applicant also argues "Sherman is one example of embedding audio. However, **this audio is not perceivable as it is 'outside' the normal audio/video bandwidth of a receiving system**. As such, this again **requires special equipment to receive the information**". This is a gross misrepresentation of the Sherman teachings, and is

in stark contrast to the actual teachings of Sherman, inter alia, Column 2, Line 20 through Column 3, Line 20, stating "...In accordance with the above objectives, the present invention provides a communication system using an encoded audio broadcast signal which is **played over the speaker of an ordinary television or radio**. The signal is encoded with tones representing various information. The information is communicated to members of the public who **do not need special receiving equipment to receive the communication**. Information **is encoded in-band** in the same broadcast as a television or radio program, and **so is detectable by a listening device directly from the usual speaker** and can be taped for later or repeated use by a broadcaster or listener. At the same time, the encoded information is substantially indiscernible to people watching or listening to the program which contains the information and therefore does not disturb an ordinary program or require blanking of part of the program signal to provide a dedicated portion for encoded information. FIG. 1 illustrates how tones of the audible range, such as Touch-Tones (697-1477 Hz), **can be added to the audio-video tape 44 of a regular program**. The tones are created by a studio engineer using a Touch-Tones generator 40. This is done at the same time as the engineer creates the program's usual sound effects with a sound effects generator 42, or later. The tones and the usual sound effects are added at appropriate places to the audio-video tape 44 of the program using a tape recorder 46. There are other ways to ensure that an **appropriate tone is included in the audio portion of a television or radio broadcast**. For example, an engineer watching the program as it is recorded or as it is broadcast live could use a Touch-Tone generator 40 to create the tones appropriate to the action of the program, thereby causing the **tones to be included in the initial audio tape or to be broadcast as part of a live transmission**...."

26. It is clear from this section alone that the arguments set forth by Applicant are completely baseless. The simple use of the Sherman methodology of information encoding in an audio signal was disclosed, and was readily incorporated in a network information distribution system, for example, as set forth by Portuesi, as detailed in the prior and present rejections. The breadth of discussion by Applicant in the response substantially hinders prosecution of the current application. Additionally, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

27. The incremental prosecution methods employed by Applicant hinders advancement of the application. Substantial modification and discussion of the claimed subject matter is required to obviate current and future rejections based on the current art of record.

28. As a general matter, not only the specific teachings of a reference but also reasonable inferences which an artisan would have logically drawn therefrom may be properly evaluated in formulating a rejection. *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825, 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968) and *In re Sherpard*, 319 F.2d 194, 138 USPQ 148 (CCPA 1963). Skill in the art is presumed. *In re*

*Sovish*, 769 F.2d 738, 226 USPQ 771 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Furthermore, artisans must be presumed to know something about the art apart from what the references disclose. *In re Jacoby*, 309 F.2d 738, 226 USPQ 317 (CCPA 1962). The conclusion of obviousness may be made from common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference. *In re Bozek*, 416 F.2d 738, 1385 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969). Every reference relies to some extent on knowledge of persons skilled in the to complement that which is disclosed therein. *In re Bode*, 550 F.2d 656, 193 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1977). Lastly, *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971), clearly states "any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning, but so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within level of ordinary skill at the time claimed invention was made and does not include knowledge gleaned only from applicant's disclosure, reconstruction is proper".

29. Applicant arguments remain lacking of substantive content to warrant detailed discussion, especially as compared to the prior art of record, as applied. The breadth of the claims and the breadth of the discussion by Applicant is hindering advancement of the claimed subject matter. Once again, significant detail (for example, incorporation of claims 2 and 3 into independent claim(s) 1, 6, and 11) is suggested as a starting point, to overcome the issue(s) of breadth, similarity of the claimed invention and the prior art, and isolation of the feature(s) which Applicant considers to be the actual invention, not simply the prior art systems as were well known and widely implemented at the time of invention.

30. Applicant has not seasonably challenged the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP

§2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. storage of audio, video, and embedded coded information in a digital file (or set of digitally stored files) in a computer networking environment was well known in the art at the time the invention was made, are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

***Conclusion***

31. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

32. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc D. Thompson whose telephone number is 571-272-3932. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9am-4pm. If attempts to reach the

examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski, Jr. can be reached at 571-272-3925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned remains 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MARC D. THOMPSON
MARC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Marc D. Thompson
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2144